

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
AT CHATTANOOGA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
vs. ) Case No. 1:08-CR-118  
RAYMOND TATE ) )  
 ) MATTICE/CARTER

---

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Defendant has filed a *pro se* Motion Challenging Jurisdiction (Doc. 32). I conclude the defendant's motion is without merit for the reasons set out in the United States' Response to Defendant's Motion Challenging Jurisdiction. I therefore RECOMMEND the defendant's Motion Challenging Jurisdiction be DENIED.<sup>1</sup>

Dated: July 9, 2009

William B. Mitchell Carter

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Any objections to this Report and Recommendation must be served and filed within ten (10) days after service of a copy of this recommended disposition on the objecting party. Such objections must conform to the requirements of Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Failure to file objections within the time specified waives the right to appeal the District Court's order. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 88 L.Ed.2d 435, 106 S.Ct. 466 (1985). The district court need not provide *de novo* review where objections to this report and recommendation are frivolous, conclusive or general. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636 (6th Cir. 1986). Only specific objections are reserved for appellate review. *Smith v. Detroit Federation of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370 (6th Cir. 1987).